

Curvature Singularities from Gravitational Contraction in $f(R)$ Gravity

Lorenzo Reverberi*

*Dipartimento di Fisica e Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Ferrara
Polo Scientifico e Tecnologico - Edificio C, Via Saragat 1, 44122 Ferrara, Italy and
Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Sezione di Ferrara
Polo Scientifico e Tecnologico - Edificio C, Via Saragat 1, 44122 Ferrara, Italy*

The discovery of the accelerated expansion of the Universe has had a vast resonance on a number of physical disciplines. In recent years several viable modified gravity models have been proposed, which naturally lead to a late-time de Sitter stage while basically reducing to General Relativity in the early Universe. We consider a contracting cloud of pressureless dust, having arbitrary mass and initial density, and discuss some aspects of these modified gravity models. We show how the increasing energy/mass density may lead to a curvature singularity and discuss the typical timescales for its development.

I. INTRODUCTION

The physical mechanism behind the present acceleration of the cosmological expansion [1] is still unknown. A pure cosmological constant term is quite natural both in General Relativity and in Quantum Field Theory, but then there remains the challenge of explaining the present value of Λ , in particular its smallness and the fact that $\Omega_m \sim \Omega_\Lambda$ (coincidence problem).

More complicated but popular scenarios involve “quintessence” [2] models, in which a scalar field coupled to gravity is responsible for the acceleration, or modified gravity models, in which the acceleration is due to modifications of the Einstein-Hilbert action and therefore of the Einstein field equations. In the simplest case, the gravitational lagrangian is a non-linear function of the scalar curvature R alone:¹

$$\begin{aligned} A_{grav} &= -\frac{m_{Pl}^2}{16\pi} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} f(R) \\ &\equiv -\frac{m_{Pl}^2}{16\pi} \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} [R + F(R)] . \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

In this paper, we discuss the contraction of a nearly-homogeneous cloud of pressureless dust in $f(R)$ gravity models. The arguments presented here should be considered an extension to those in [3], where the appearance of singularities was shown numerically and discussed semi-analytically, and in [4]. Also, there is a strong relation between the singularities dealt with in this paper and those considered in past cosmological scenarios, e.g. in refs. [5, 6]. From a slightly different perspective, gravitational contraction in $f(R)$ gravity has been recently discussed in [7].

We find that the increase in the energy/mass density may indeed lead to curvature singularities, and that these are unavoidable if the contraction lasts long enough. Most results are quite general, and can be applied to a few popular models [8–10] constructed to generate a late-time de Sitter stage.

Usually, singularities are assumed to be prevented by the addition of ultraviolet corrections to the gravitational lagrangian [3, 6], for instance quadratic terms which are natural when one-loop quantum corrections are considered [11]. A fully non-perturbative approach, taking into account all possible higher-order corrections, may shed more light on singularities in gravitational theories, or lack thereof [12].

Moreover, an oscillating scalar curvature gives rise to gravitational particle production, whose back-reaction on gravity is a damping of the oscillations of R [14]. This can also help avoiding the singularity, and could in principle yield detectable cosmic ray signatures [15].

II. CURVATURE EVOLUTION IN CONTRACTING SYSTEMS

From eq. (1), one obtains the field equations

$$\begin{aligned} f'(R)R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}f(R)g_{\mu\nu} + \\ + (g_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{D}^2 - \mathcal{D}_\mu\mathcal{D}_\nu)f'(R) = T_{\mu\nu} . \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, \mathcal{D} denotes covariant derivative, a prime denotes derivative with respect to R , and

$$T_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{8\pi}{m_{Pl}^2} \frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta A_m}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} ,$$

where A_m is the matter action. The corresponding trace equation reads

$$3\mathcal{D}^2 F' + RF' - 2F - (R + T) = 0 . \quad (3)$$

We will consider a nearly homogeneous, spherically symmetric cloud of pressureless dust, hence $T = 8\pi\rho/m_{Pl}^2$.

* reverberi@fe.infn.it

¹ We use natural units $c = \hbar = k = 1$, and the Planck mass is defined as $m_{Pl}^2 = G_N^{-1}$. The metric has signature $(+ - - -)$, and we use the conventions $\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}g^{\alpha\beta}(\partial_\mu g_{\beta\nu} + \dots)$, $R_{\mu\beta\nu}^\alpha = \partial_\beta \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^\alpha + \dots$, $R_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\alpha\nu}^\alpha$, $R = R_\mu^\mu$. With these conventions, $R < 0$ for a matter-dominated Universe.

It can also be shown that spatial derivatives can be neglected [3]. Moreover, we assume to be in low-gravity regime, so that $|F/R| \ll 1$, $|F'| \ll 1$, the spacetime is nearly Minkowski, and covariant derivatives reduce in first approximation to ordinary derivatives. Indeed, these arguments can also be applied to cosmology, if we consider the evolution of the Universe, backwards in time, during the matter-dominated epoch.

Under these assumptions, eq. (3) becomes

$$3\partial_t^2 F' - (R + T) = 0. \quad (4)$$

Defining the new scalar field

$$\xi \equiv -3F', \quad (5)$$

we rewrite it as an oscillator equation:

$$\ddot{\xi} + (R + T) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \ddot{\xi} + \frac{\partial U}{\partial \xi} = 0. \quad (6)$$

In general, it is not possible to invert (5) to obtain $R = R(\xi)$ and thus a simple form for $U(\xi)$, expect perhaps in some limit, but it is rather clear that solutions will oscillate around the GR solution $R + T = 0$, with frequency roughly given by

$$\omega_\xi^2 \simeq \left. \frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial \xi^2} \right|_{R+T=0} = \left. \frac{1}{\partial \xi / \partial R} \right|_{R+T=0}. \quad (7)$$

If $\omega^2 < 0$, one expects instabilities, and this is exactly the kind of instability first discovered by Dolgov and Kawasaki [13]. Even with $\omega^2 > 0$, we will show that if the model fulfils some requirements, then curvature *singularities* can be developed. In particular, we need that

- there exist a certain value ξ_{sing} corresponding to $|R| \rightarrow \infty$,
- the potential be finite in ξ_{sing} , that is $U(\xi_{sing}) < \infty$.

If the previous requirements are met, then in general it is possible that ξ reach ξ_{sing} and hence $|R| \rightarrow \infty$. We can see this, for instance, from the “energy” conservation equation associated to (6), that is

$$\frac{1}{2} \dot{\xi}^2 + U(\xi) - \int^t dt' \frac{\partial T}{\partial t'} \xi(t') = \text{const.} \quad (8)$$

The last term is due to the (possible) explicit time-dependence of T , and if $\partial T / \partial t > 0$, as is the case in contracting systems, it will in general produce an increase in the “canonical” energy (kinetic + potential). Note that this is true for $\xi > 0$, whereas for $\xi < 0$ it would give the opposite behaviour. However, it has been shown that the condition $F' < 0$, corresponding to $\xi > 0$, is crucial for the correct behaviour of the modified gravity model at (relatively) low curvatures [6].

For simplicity, let us assume that the oscillations of ξ in its potential are “adiabatic”, in the sense that at each oscillation ξ moves between two values ξ_{min} and ξ_{max} at roughly the same “height”, that is with $U(\xi_{min}) = U(\xi_{max})$. Then, if at some moment $U(\xi) = U(\xi_{sing})$, we expect that $\xi \rightarrow \xi_{sing}$ within at most the following oscillation. In what follows, we will show that this is a rather natural result, provided that the contraction lasts long enough, or better that the contraction factor $T_{final}/T_{initial}$ is large enough.

We expand ξ around the “average” value $\xi = \xi_a(t)$ corresponding to the GR solution, namely

$$\xi(t) = \xi_a(t) + \xi_1(t) \quad (9a)$$

$$\equiv \xi_a(t) + \alpha(t) \sin \Phi(t), \quad (9b)$$

where

$$R(\xi_a) + T = 0 \quad (10)$$

and

$$\Phi(t) \simeq \int^t dt' \omega. \quad (11)$$

The function α is assumed to be relatively slowly-varying, that is $\dot{\alpha}/\alpha < \omega$.

A. First-Order Expansion

At first order in ξ_1 (defined in eq. 9a), eq. (6) reads

$$\ddot{\xi}_1 + \omega^2 \xi_1 \simeq -\ddot{\xi}_a. \quad (12)$$

Using the expansion (9b) and neglecting $\ddot{\xi}_a$ and $\ddot{\alpha}$ yields

$$\frac{\dot{\omega}}{\omega} \simeq -2 \frac{\dot{\alpha}}{\alpha} \Rightarrow \alpha(t) \simeq \alpha_0 \sqrt{\frac{\omega_0}{\omega(t)}}. \quad (13)$$

As long as the approximations hold, this can be considered a rather general result, and the specific $F(R)$ model will determine the behaviour of the oscillations. The value α_0 in eq. (13) is strictly related to the initial conditions we impose, that is to the initial displacement from the GR behaviour. We will in general set the initial values of R and \dot{R} , and from those derive the initial values of ξ and $\dot{\xi}$. Thus, α_0 can be calculated differentiating eq. (9b), which yields

$$\dot{\xi}_0(R_0, \dot{R}_0) \simeq \dot{\xi}_{a,0} + \alpha_0 \omega_0 \Rightarrow \alpha_0 \simeq \frac{\dot{\xi}_0 - \dot{\xi}_{a,0}}{\omega_0}. \quad (14)$$

This corresponds to the explicit solution

$$\alpha(t) \simeq \left(\dot{\xi}_0 - \dot{\xi}_{a,0} \right) \left[\omega_0 \omega(t) \right]^{-1/2}. \quad (15)$$

Please note that, apparently, we have not made use of the assumption $U(\xi_{sing}) < \infty$. Although not necessary to perform calculations, this condition is needed to ensure

that expansion (9) be reliable. In fact, oscillations are harmonic only if the potential is nearly quadratic; this assumption is usually quite reasonable, especially near the bottom of the potential, but loses its validity, for instance, near points at which U diverges. Therefore, models in which

$$U(\xi, t) \simeq T(t)\xi + \int^\xi R(\xi')d\xi' \quad (16)$$

is singular in $\xi = \xi_{sing}$, unlike the three models [8–10] we will explicitly consider later, cannot be discussed within the framework of this paper.

Also, it is clear from eq. (15) that if $\dot{\xi}_0 = \dot{\xi}_{\alpha,0}$ the amplitude of oscillations should vanish at all times. This can be immediately proved wrong, for instance numerically. The disagreement with our estimate is due to the fact that we had neglected $\ddot{\xi}_a$, and in general terms proportional to $1/t_{contr}^2$, in eq. (12). When α is initially very small, however, those terms should be kept and the approximations used are no longer valid. Therefore, eq. (15) is reliable when $(\dot{\xi}_0 - \dot{\xi}_{\alpha,0})$ is “large” enough, say of the order of $\xi_{\alpha,0}$.

III. GENERATION OF CURVATURE SINGULARITIES

The singularity develops as soon as $\xi = \xi_{sing}$, or soon after $U(\xi) = U(\xi_{sing})$. Exploiting the results of the previous paragraph, we see that this is basically equivalent to the condition

$$|\xi_a(t) - \xi_{sing}| \leq \alpha(t). \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the singularity should be reached roughly at the moment when condition (17) is fulfilled. Substituting (13) results in

$$|\xi_a(t) - \xi_{sing}| \leq \left| \dot{\xi}_0 - \dot{\xi}_{a,0} \right| (\omega \omega_0)^{-1/2}. \quad (18)$$

In order to discuss these results more quantitatively, we shall apply them to three models which have recently been proposed:

$$F(R) = -\frac{\lambda R_c}{1 + (R/R_c)^{-2n}}, \quad [8] \quad (19a)$$

$$F(R) = \lambda R_c \left[\left(1 + \frac{R^2}{R_c^2} \right)^{-n} - 1 \right], \quad [9] \quad (19b)$$

$$F(R) = R_c \ln \left[e^{-\lambda} + (1 - e^{-\lambda}) e^{-R/R_c} \right]. [10] \quad (19c)$$

Note that for all three models, if λ is of order unity R_c is of the order of the present cosmological constant, which is much smaller than the typical values of R and T in astrophysical systems, such as pre-stellar, pre-galactic, and molecular clouds. Hence, in many cases we will take the limit $|R_c/T| \sim R_c/R \ll 1$ before presenting the final results.

For simplicity, we assume that the contraction of the system is stationary, i.e. the mass density grows linearly with time:

$$T(t) = T_0 (1 + t/t_{contr}). \quad (20)$$

This evolution law is not completely accurate from a physical standpoint, but unless the contraction follows a very different behaviour, and in any case until $t \lesssim t_{contr}$, which is assumed to be the typical timescale of contraction, results obtained with this form should be more or less accurate. In order to have simple and somewhat reliable estimates, we will use the initial conditions

$$\begin{cases} R_0 = -T_0 \\ \dot{R}_0 = 0. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

Depending on physical and model parameters, we will calculate the “critical” energy density T_{sing} , at which the singularity arises. The timescale for the formation of the singularity, as can be seen from eq. (20), is in general

$$t_{sing} \simeq t_{contr} \left(\frac{T_{sing}}{T_0} - 1 \right). \quad (22)$$

As previously stressed, the evolution law (20) can be considered somewhat reliable until t is of the order of magnitude of t_{contr} , so we will focus on combinations of parameters in which T_{sing}/T_0 is at most a few. Furthermore, we will define the following quantities:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{29} &\equiv \frac{m_{Pl}^2}{8\pi} \frac{|R_c|}{10^{-29} \text{ g cm}^{-3}}, \\ \varrho_{29} &\equiv \frac{\varrho_0}{10^{-29} \text{ g cm}^{-3}}, \\ t_{10} &\equiv \frac{t_{contr}}{10^{10} \text{ years}}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

A. Hu-Sawicki and Starobinsky

We will show explicit expressions for the Hu-Sawicki model [8]. This model and that by Starobinsky [9] are essentially identical in the limit $|R| \gg |R_c|$, so the results of this paragraph can be applied to both models. The field ξ is

$$\xi(R) = 6n\lambda \frac{(R/R_c)^{2n-1}}{[1 + (R/R_c)^{2n}]^2}, \quad (24)$$

therefore $|R| \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to $\xi_{sing} = 0$. We also have

$$\omega^2 \simeq -\frac{R_c}{6n\lambda(2n+1)} \left(-\frac{T}{R_c} \right)^{2n+2}, \quad (25)$$

so with the initial conditions (21) we have

$$\xi_a \simeq 6n\lambda \left(-\frac{T}{R_c} \right)^{-(2n+1)} \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{\xi}_{a,0} \simeq -\frac{6n\lambda(2n+1)}{t_{contr}} \left(-\frac{T_0}{R_c}\right)^{-(2n+1)} \quad (27)$$

$$(\omega\omega_0)^{-1/2} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{6n\lambda(2n+1)}{|R_c|}} \left(\frac{T T_0}{R_c^2}\right)^{-(n+1)/2} \quad (28)$$

Substituting these expressions and using the definitions (23), eq. (18) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{T_{sing}}{T_0} &= \left(\frac{T_0^{n+1} t_{contr}}{\sqrt{6n\lambda(2n+1)^3} R_c^{n+1/2}}\right)^{2/(3n+1)} \\ &\simeq \left(0.53 \frac{\varrho_{29}^{n+1} t_{10}}{\sqrt{n\lambda(2n+1)^3} R_{29}^{n+1/2}}\right)^{2/(3n+1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Typically we would have $\lambda, R_{29} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, so from eq. (29) we see that if the initial energy density is not too large and/or the contraction is fast enough, the overall contraction needed to reach the singularity is quite realistic, with T_{sing}/T_0 possibly even only slightly larger than unity. Moreover, the larger n , the easier it is to develop the singularity with relatively small T_{sing} .

B. Appleby-Battye

In this case the field ξ is

$$\xi = \frac{3(e^\lambda - 1)}{e^\lambda - 1 + e^{R/R_c}} \simeq 3(e^\lambda - 1) e^{-R/R_c}. \quad (30)$$

We also find

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^2 &\simeq -\frac{R_c}{3(e^\lambda - 1)} e^{-T/R_c}, \\ \dot{\xi}_{a,0} &\simeq \frac{3(e^\lambda - 1)}{t_{contr}} \left(-\frac{T_0}{R_c}\right) e^{T_0/R_c}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Therefore, (18) yields

$$T_{sing} \simeq \frac{5T_0}{3} + \frac{4R_c}{3} \ln \left(-\frac{\sqrt{3(e^\lambda - 1)} T_0}{R_c^{3/2} t_{10}}\right), \quad (32)$$

which leads to

$$T_{sing} \simeq T_0 \left[\frac{5}{3} - \frac{4R_{29}}{3\varrho_{29}} \ln \left(\frac{0.91\sqrt{e^\lambda - 1}\varrho_{29}}{R_{29}^{3/2} t_{10}} \right) \right]. \quad (33)$$

As in the previous models, reasonable values of physical and model parameters may very well lead to a singularity after T has grown by a small factor from its initial value. Indeed, due to the weak logarithmic dependence and since usually one assumes $T_0 \gg |R_c|$, T_{sing} is usually very close to $5T_0/3$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

The possibility of curvature singularities in $F(R)$ gravity models in the presence of contracting bodies has been discussed in a rather simple fashion. The trace of the modified Einstein equations has been recast as an oscillator equation for the field $\xi \sim \partial F/\partial R$, which moves in a time-dependent potential $U(\xi, t)$. This equation has been solved expanding it at first order in deviations from GR. Generally speaking, solutions oscillate around the “average” value, corresponding to the GR solution $R + T = 0$, with increasing amplitude.

Models in which $|R| \rightarrow \infty$ implies neither $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ nor $U \rightarrow \infty$ are particularly suited to be discussed within this framework, and this is the case for three well-known models [8–10]. In all three cases, a curvature singularity is to be expected if the mass/energy density reaches T_{sing} , which depends both on model parameters and on physical properties of the system under consideration. For typical values of model parameters and reasonable physical systems, the singularity is expected on timescales possibly much shorter than the age of the Universe.

Two mechanisms should help avoiding the singularity, namely ultraviolet gravity modifications and gravitational particle production. The results of this work could be used both to estimate the cosmic ray flux due to gravitational particle production, and possibly to constrain modified gravity models at large curvatures [15]. This could be the subject of future research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is grateful to Prof. A.D. Dolgov for useful discussions and criticism.

[1] A.G. Riess et al., *Astron. J.*, **116** (1998) 1009 [astro-ph/9805201]; S. Perlmutter et al., *Nature* **391** (1998) 51 [astro-ph/9712212]; B.P. Schmidt et al., *Astrophys. J.* **507** (1998) 46 [astro-ph/9805200]; S. Perlmutter et al., *Astrophys. J.* **517** (1999) 565 [astro-ph/9812133]; A.G. Riess et al., *Astrophys. J.* **607** (2004) 665 [astro-ph/0402512].

[2] Y. Fujii, *Phys. Rev. D* **26** (1982) 2580; B. Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, *Phys. Rev. D* **37** (1988) 3406; R.R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P.J. Steinhardt, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 1582 [astro-ph/9708069]; C. Wetterich, *Nucl. Phys. B* **302** (1988) 668.
[3] E.V. Arbuzova and A.D. Dolgov, *Phys. Lett. B* **700** (2011) 289 [arXiv:1012.1963].

- [4] A.V. Frolov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101** (2008) 061103 [arXiv:0803.2500]; K. Bamba, S. Nojiri, and S.D. Odintsov, *Phys. Lett. B* **698** (2011) 451 [arXiv:1101.2820].
- [5] S.A. Appleby and R.A. Battye, *JCAP* **0805** (2008) 019 [arXiv:0803.1081].
- [6] S.A. Appleby, R.A. Battye and A.A. Starobinsky, *JCAP* **1006** (2010) 005 [arXiv:0909.1737].
- [7] J.A.R. Cembranos, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, B. Montes Nunez, *JCAP* **1204** (2012) 021 [arXiv:1201.1289].
- [8] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, *Phys. Rev. D* **76** (2007) 064004 [arXiv:0705.1158].
- [9] A.A. Starobinsky, *JETP Lett.* **86** (2007) 157 [arXiv:0706.2041].
- [10] S.A. Appleby and R.A. Battye, *Phys. Lett. B* **654** (2007) 7 [arXiv:0705.3199].
- [11] A.A. Starobinsky, *Phys. Lett. B* **91** (1980) 99.
- [12] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto and A. Mazumdar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 031101 [arXiv:1110.5249].
- [13] A.D. Dolgov and M. Kawasaki, *Phys. Lett. B* **573** (2003) 1 [astro-ph/0307285].
- [14] E.V. Arbuzova, A.D. Dolgov and L. Reverberi, *JCAP* **02** (2012) 049 [arXiv:1112.4995].
- [15] E.V. Arbuzova, A.D. Dolgov and L. Reverberi, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **72** (2012) 2247 [arXiv:1211.5011]; E.V. Arbuzova, A.D. Dolgov and L. Reverberi, work in preparation.